

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Washington, D.C. 20231	Ma
	THE PROPERTY NO.

		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST TEMES III	
09/074,0	12 05/05	/98 YOSHIDA	s 0694-121
_		٦	EXAMINER
JAE H KI		IM52/0426	PIANALTO, B. ARTUNIT PAPER NUMBER
60 EAST	CALIMAFDE 42ND STREE NY 10165	т	1762 DATE MAILED:
			04/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/074,012	YOSHIDA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		ilto 1762
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	pars on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		
ind for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL  THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  THE period of the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1  THE period of the provision of 37 CFR 1.1  THE period of the provision of 37 CFR 1.1  A proper of the period of the per	136 (a). In the statutory minimum of the will apply and will expire SIX (6) Money, cause the application to become any date of this communication, even	nirty (30) days will be considered timely.  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
AND Pesnonsive to communication(s) filed on 12	April 2001	
Responsive to commentation     Application is FinAL. 2b) This action is FinAL. 2b) This action is FinAL. 2b This act	IIIS action to	natters, prosecution as to the ments is C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
a) Sisposition of Claims  4) ○ Claim(s) 10-27 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-27 is/are withdress. Signar allowed.  5) ○ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  7) ○ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ○ Claims are subject to restriction an are subject to restriction an are subject to restriction and are subjected to by the Examology of the specification is objected to by the Examology of the drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examology of the specification is objected to be specification is objected to by the Examology of the specification is objected to be specifica	d/or election requirement miner. ted to by the Examiner. is: a)∐ approved he Examiner.	b)□ disapproved.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a claim for a cl	iments have been receive uments have been receive e priority documents have nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17	ed. ed in Application No e been received in this National Stage 2(a)). tes not received.
Attachment(s)  15) Nolice of References Cited (PTO-892)  16) Nolice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC  17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper	o-948) 19) 🔲	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 01-01)

Application/Control Number: 09/074,012

Art Unit: 1762

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Restriction as required by the action of 03-19-01 is still considered proper for the following reasons:

- Claims 10-14, drawn to a device, classified in class 428, subclass 693.
- II. Claims 15-21, drawn to combination, classified in class 428, subclass 457.
- III. Claims 22-27, drawn to a method, classified in class 156, subclass 349.
  The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects since the claims of Group II require an electrically conductive substrate and the claims of Group I do not.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process such as magnetic recording.

Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially

Application/Control Number: 09/074,012

Art Unit: 1762

different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the combination could be used for magnetic recording.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over either Goto et al for the same reasons as urged in the action of 8-31-00 or Horie et al. The Horie et al reference discloses in the abstract a magnet core comprising iron powder and a heat conducting non-magnetic powder dispersed in a resin binder and cured. The core is used in an electronic device. It is the examiner's opinion that applicant's device is at the very least an obvious variation of the device of either reference. Also the limitations of the dependent claims are conventional and do not render these claims unobvious.

Application/Control Number: 09/074,012 Art Unit: 1762

Applicant's arguments filed 4-12-01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the Goto et al reference discloses in Col. 13, lines 50-65 that alumina may be included in the magnetic layer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bernard D Pianalto whose telephone number is 3082332. The examiner can normally be reached on Mo - Th 5:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on 703 308 2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305 3599 for regular communications and 703 305 3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 306 5665.

19 April 24, 2001 Art Unit: 1762

BERNARD PIANALTO PRIMARY EXAMINER